



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,363	03/12/2004	Naoto Matono	118531	7160
25944	7590	09/20/2006	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			KLIMOWICZ, WILLIAM JOSEPH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/798,363	MATONO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William J. Klimowicz	2627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1 and 6-9 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 2 and 3 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Specie I (corresponding to Figures 1-4), which the Applicant contends reads on claims 1-3 and 6-9) in the reply filed on August 4, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that:

It is also respectfully submitted that the subject matter of all species is sufficiently related that a thorough search for the subject matter of any one species would encompass a search for the subject matter of the remaining species. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the search and examination of the entire application could be made without serious burden. See MPEP §803 in which it is stated that "if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions" (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that this policy should apply in the present application in order to avoid unnecessary delay and expense to Applicants and duplicative examination by the Patent Office.

See pages 1-2 of the Response filed on August 4, 2006.

This is not found persuasive because the Examiner maintains that each identified Species and/or Invention grouping, as articulated in the previous Requirement for Restriction, would impose a grave and serious burden upon the Examiner. Moreover, in accordance with **37 CFR 1.104**, to the nature of each distinctly grouped Species and/or Invention grouping, the Examiner must make a thorough study thereof and a thorough investigation of the available prior art relating to the claimed subject matter of each distinctly identified Species and/or Grouping. The examination for each distinct Specie/Grouping must be complete with respect both to compliance of the application with the applicable statutes and rules and to the patentability of the invention

as claimed, in addition to matters of form, including **Title 35** to the **United States Code**, sections **101, 102, 103** and **112** to each distinctly grouped invention.

Because these inventions are **independent or distinct** for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is **PROPER**.

More specifically, as set forth in **MPEP § 803**:

Under the statute an application may properly be required to be restricted to one of two or more claimed inventions only if they are able to support separate patents and they are either independent (**MPEP § 806.04 - § 806.04(i)**) **or** distinct (**MPEP § 806.05 - § 806.05(i)**). [Emphasis in bold italics added].

Moreover as set forth in **MPEP § 802.01**, the meaning of independent “and” distinct within the context of Patent Office restriction policy and practice is articulated as follows:

35 U.S.C. 121 quoted in the preceding section states that the Commissioner may require restriction if two or more “independent and distinct” inventions are claimed in one application. In **37 CFR 1.141**, the statement is made that two or more “independent and distinct inventions” may not be claimed in one application.

This raises the question of the subjects as between which the Commissioner may require restriction. This, in turn, depends on the construction of the expression “independent and distinct” inventions.

“Independent,” of course, means not dependent. If “distinct” means the same thing, then its use in the statute and in the rule is redundant. If “distinct” means something different, then the question arises as to what the difference in meaning between these two words may be. The hearings before the committees of Congress considering the codification of the patent laws indicate that **35 U.S.C. 121**: “enacts as law existing practice with respect to division, at the same time introducing a number of changes.”

The report on the hearings does not mention as a change that is introduced, the subjects between which the Commissioner may properly require division.

The term “independent” as already pointed out, means not dependent. A large number of subjects between which, prior to the **1952 Act**, division had been proper, are dependent subjects, such as, for example, combination and a subcombination thereof; as process and apparatus used in the practice of the process; as composition and the process in which the composition is used; as process and the product made by such process, etc. If section **121** of the **1952 Act** were intended to direct the Commissioner never to approve division between dependent inventions, the word “independent” would clearly have been used alone. If the Commissioner has authority or discretion to restrict independent inventions only, then restriction would be improper as between dependent inventions, e.g., the examples used for purpose of illustration above. Such was clearly not the intent of Congress. Nothing in the language of the statute and nothing in the hearings of the committees indicate any intent to change the substantive law on this subject. On the contrary, joinder of the term “distinct” with the term “independent,” indicates lack of such intent. The law has long been established that dependent inventions (frequently termed related inventions) such as used for illustration above may be properly divided if they are, in fact, “distinct” inventions, even though dependent.

Thus, clearly, the restriction is proper if the Examiner shows that the inventions are distinct **or** independent, but not necessarily both independent *and* distinct.

Moreover, each separately grouped specie/invention must be thoroughly searched, including, but not limited to, various searching fields, inclusive of differing text search strategies and/or queries, determination of anticipation, if any, of uncovered prior art, potential application of the Graham factual inquiries to each distinct specie/invention to review for any indicia of possible obviousness, etc.

Moreover still, as has been held, if there is an express admission that the claimed inventions would have been obvious over each other within the meaning of **35 U.S.C. § 103**, restriction should not be required. *In re Lee*, 199 USPQ 108 (Comm'r Pat. 1978).

There is nothing on record, at present, to show that the distinctly grouped species/inventions are obvious variants.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

Claim Status

Claims 1-9 are currently pending.

Claims 1-3 and 6-9 have been considered on the merits, and have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Claims 4 and 5 are currently withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected Invention/specie, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on August 4, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lin (US 2003/0043513 A1).

As per claim 1, Lin (US 2003/0043513 A1) discloses a thin film magnetic head (e.g., see Fig. 2) including: a thin film coil (11) for generating a magnetic flux; a magnetic pole layer (22)

extending rearward from a recording-medium-facing surface to be faced with a recording medium (17, 18) which moves in a medium travel direction, the magnetic pole layer (22) for emitting a magnetic flux generated by the thin film coil (11) to the recording medium (17, 18); a first magnetic shield layer (23) extending rearward from the recording-medium-facing surface on the side of the medium travel direction with respect to the magnetic pole layer (22), the first magnetic shield layer (23) being disposed so as to be separated from the magnetic pole layer by a gap layer (insulative material between (28) and (23), supporting coil (11)) on the side close to the recording-medium-facing surface and to be coupled to the magnetic pole layer via a back gap (at junction where (22) and (23) connect and contact) on the side far apart from the recording-medium-facing surface; and a second magnetic shield layer ((16) or (26)) extending rearward from the recording-medium-facing surface on the side of the direction opposite to the medium travel direction with respect to the magnetic pole layer (22), wherein the first magnetic shield (23) layer extends rearward relative to the back gap and is physically isolated from the second magnetic shield layer (16/26) - see Fig. 2.

As per claim 6, wherein the first magnetic shield layer (23) prevents divergence of a magnetic flux emitted from the magnetic pole layer (22) - that is, the magnetic flux emitted by poletip (28) is *converged* back to pole (23)).

As per claim 7, further including a magnetoresistive element (15) which performs magnetic processing utilizing a magnetoresistance effect, wherein the second magnetic shield layer (16/26) magnetically isolates the magnetoresistive element from there around.

As per claim 8, wherein the magnetic pole layer (22) is configured to emit a magnetic flux for magnetizing the recording medium (17, 18) in a direction perpendicular to a surface of the recording medium (17, 18).

Additionally, as per claim 9, also discloses a magnetic recording apparatus (e.g., disk drive; see paragraph [0001]) having a recording medium (17, 18).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William J. Klimowicz whose telephone number is (571) 272-7577. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (6:30AM-5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoa Thi Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7579. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


William J. Klimowicz
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2627

WJK